

## REMARKS

### Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney, William Breen, wishes to thank Examiner Rutledge for the  
5 telephone interview conducted October 3, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the Wang  
and Santos references. Applicant's attorney presented arguments that distinguished  
Applicant's disclosure from the references of record. Specifically, Applicant's attorney  
pointed out that Applicant's embodiments modify a *structured document prior to*  
10 *transforming* the structured document into another document suitable for presentation  
(such as an HTML document). In contrast, both Wang and Santos teach the *modification*  
*of a transformation file* that is then used to transform a source file.

In order to advance prosecution, Applicant's attorney and Examiner Rutledge  
agreed that if Applicant amended independent claim 1 to clarify that "*modifying occurs*  
15 *prior to transforming the structured document into another document suitable for*  
*presentation*", that claim 1 would be allowable over the art of record. Accordingly,  
Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested by Examiner Rutledge. In addition,  
Applicant has amended independent claim 25 in a similar manner.

Claims 24 and 26 have been amended to clarify that the transformation module  
20 transforms the structured document "*after the structured document has been modified*  
*by the upgrade module.*"

Additionally, in the last Office Action, Examiner Rutledge indicated that claim 12  
would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has  
amended independent claim 20 with the language of claim 12.

25 Applicant's attorney understood the Examiner to consider the claims as amended  
allowable over the art of record but indicated that the allowance of the claims is subject to  
an additional search.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if Examiner Rutledge thinks there are  
any further issues that might delay issuance. Applicant greatly appreciates examiner  
30 Rutledge's willingness to assist Applicant in advancing prosecution.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 9 and 10 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claims 9 and 10 as suggested by the Office, as such, the objections should be withdrawn.

### **Rejections under § 101**

Claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claims 24 and 25 so that they recite “One or more computer readable media.”

In addition, Applicant has amended independent claims 20 and 25 so that they produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Applicant notes that both claims recite the ability to *determine* whether a particular version of the processing functionality has been created that warrants generation of the upgrade module. Furthermore, Applicant has amended claims 20 and 25 to recite *when the determination indicates that generation of the upgrade module is warranted*, generate the upgrade module.

Accordingly, independent claims 20, 24, 25, and 26 are allowable as are dependent claims 21, 22, and 23 which depend from independent claim 20.

### **Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2007

By: /William J. Breen, III, #45,313/  
William J. Breen III  
Reg. No. 45,313  
Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby  
509.755.7253